

SHIPPING INTELLIGENCE.

ARRIVAL.
July 31.—Chieftain, schooner, 78 tons, Captain Strachan, from the South Sea Islands the 6th July.

The ship signalled to the northward yesterday morning passed the port. She is supposed to be a whaler.

A Prussian ship was off the Heads all day yesterday, but could not get in, owing to the light and variable wind. She is likely to be the *Wilhelmine* from Adelaide.

DEPARTURES.
July 31.—Liberty, schooner, 55 tons, Captain Johnson, for Wide Bay.

July 31.—Lester, barque, 276 tons, Captain Salmon, for Manila. Passenger—Mrs. Salmon.

July 31.—Lillias, for Geelong, resumed her voyage.

PROJECTED DEPARTURES.
This day.—Independence, for the South Sea Fisheries; Phantom, for Adelaide; Hiron-delle, for Melbourne.

CLEARANCES.
July 31.—Phantom, brig, 158 tons, Captain Brown, for Adelaide. Passengers: Mr. J. Davis, Mrs. Hogan, Mr. and Mrs. King and two children, Mrs. Cooper, Miss Fortescue, and Thomas Taylor.

July 31.—Hiron-delle, schooner, 100 tons, Captain Laphrore, for Melbourne. Passengers: Mr. Ogden, Miss Purnell, Mr. and Mrs. Purnell, Mr. and Mrs. King and two children, J. C. and J. H. H. and wife, and T. Robertson.

COASTERS INWARDS.
July 31.—Kilgobbin, schooner, from Twofold Bay, with 165 packages dry goods, 10 tons bark, 1025 bales wool, 1500 treacels, 6 casks butter, 1825 packages tallow, 20 hides.

COASTERS OUTWARDS.
July 31.—Nightingale, 40, Smith, for the Moruya, with sundries; Sea Bird, 20, Miller, for Shoalhaven, with sundries.

IMPORTS.
July 31.—Chieftain, from the South Sea Islands: 60 tons cocoa-nut oil, Flower, Salting, and Co.

July 31.—Ranger, whaler, returned to Port: 755 barrels sperm oil, Ord, and Co.

EXPORTS.
July 31.—Hiron-delle, for Melbourne: 10 casks manufactured tobacco, Lamb, Barbery, and Co.; 2 casks cigars, W. Scott; 1 cask furniture, 1 cask clocks, 4 casks glass, 1 cask glue, J. C. and J. H. H. and wife, and T. Robertson.

July 31.—Phantom, for Adelaide: 61 logs cedar, 254 bags maize, Sheppard and Alger; 166 bags maize, H. H. Sheppard; 1 cask honey, J. Longmore; 17 casks oranges, John W. and J. C. and J. H. H. and wife, and T. Robertson.

July 31.—Phantom, for Adelaide: 61 logs cedar, 254 bags maize, Sheppard and Alger; 166 bags maize, H. H. Sheppard; 1 cask honey, J. Longmore; 17 casks oranges, John W. and J. C. and J. H. H. and wife, and T. Robertson.

SHIPS' MAIL.
Mails will close at the Post Office as follows:—

For England via Valparaiso.—By the Captain Cook, this evening, at six.

For Adelaide, via the Thames and Henry, this evening, at six.

For England via Calcutta.—By the Captain Cook, this evening, at six.

For Australia.—By the Moon, this evening, at six.

For Launceston via Melbourne.—By the Shamrock, steamer, this day, at half-past four o'clock.

For London.—By the Bondicor, on Monday evening, at six.

Custom House. Entered outwards: July 31, Packet, schooner, 183, Thompson, from the South Sea Islands; Martin and Elizabeth, schooner, 82, Hanson, for Melbourne; Christina, brig, 126, Koff, for Melbourne; Petrel, 61, Wilkinson, for Circular Head.

The Ranger, whaler, from London, having been compelled to turn to port, her cargo, comprising 750 barrels sperm oil, will be landed at D-lolite's Wharf.

The Chieftain has been cruising among the islands of the South Sea collecting coconut oil, about 40 tons of which she has now on board, consigned to Messrs. Flower, Salting, and Co. of this city. On the 19th April, in lat. 1° south, and long. 179° east, spoke the whaling bark, *William*, of Robert Town, Captain Richardson, touched at Stewart's Island, where he heard of Captain Richards, late of the Vanguard, lying in a very dangerous state of health. Captain Strachan supplied him with tea, sugar, medicines, &c., and restored his weak constitution; but it was reported that there were no hopes of his recovery.

More than one-half the ships advertised in the *Times* and *Advertiser* for these dates. We give a list of them, observing, however, that many of them would not sail for several months. Messrs. Green advertise for Sydney direct.—The Malacca, Redoute, Blackwell, Newell, and others, and others. Other owners advertise for Sydney direct.—The *Dudbrook* (arrived), and the *Bank of England*, for Port Phillip direct.—The *Balleenagh*, the *Statenland*, the *Troubadour*, the *Melbourne*, the *Domestic*, the *Bangalore*, and the *Lady Nugent*, for Auckland.

The *Thames* and the *Sinhal*, for New Zealand (no port named).—The *Columba*, the *Lord William Bentinck*, the *Barbara Gordon*, the *Sir Edward Paget*, the *Victory*, the *Creswell*, the *Stately*, and the *Clara*. There were many more ships than those laid on at the time, but we do not recollect over seeing so many advertised in one paper.

DIARY.
MEMORANDA TO NEXT PUBLICATION.

August. SUN rises 5.10 sets 6.10. MOON first quarter, 3.12 P.M., August 4.

THE Sydney Morning Herald.
FRIDAY, AUGUST 1, 1861.

"Sworn to no Master, of no Sect am I."

THE GOLD NEWS.
The news from the gold district is fully confirmatory of the previous reports as to the richness of the Turon diggings.

There can be no doubt that fortunes are being made by some, that a very large proportion of the entire population are earning highly remunerative wages, and that there are very few who are not doing well. Our correspondent and the local press agree upon this point.

The Government escort, yesterday, only brought down 182 ounces for Messrs. L. and S. Samuel. A large quantity, however, came down through the mail: 250 ounces to Mr. DANIEL, about 200 ounces to the Commercial Bank, and smaller parcels to Messrs. SMITH, CAMPBELL, and Co., and Mr. R. CAMPBELL, SENR. Mr. DANIEL, of

the firm of THACKER and Co., who was a passenger, brought down 780 ounces. Some other arrangements will have to be made as to the escort, for there is nothing to prevent parties from coming down on the days the mail is escorted, and bringing gold with their luggage, or they can send it on those days through the mail, and thus have the benefit of the escort without paying anything for it.

Tenders for the purchase of the Government gold were sent in yesterday, and referred to the Board appointed to open them, but the amounts tendered for, or the price offered, did not transpire.

It has been previously stated that the hundred weight of gold found by Dr. KERR had been purchased for Messrs. THACKER and Co., for £1160. On Tuesday evening, Mr. DANIEL took this gold out of the Bank, at Bathurst, for the purpose of bringing it with him by the mail. In the course of the evening, Mr. Commissioner HARDY, on the part of the Government, demanded it. Mr. DANIEL declined to give it up, or allow it to be taken without force, when it was forcibly taken possession of by Mr. HARDY, and removed. We are not aware whether Mr. HARDY acted under instructions from Sydney, or what the intention of the Government may be; the proceeding, however, appears a very strange one. Had the Government seized it when in the possession of Dr. KERR, or the blackfellow that found it, neither of whom had a license to dig for gold, we think they would have been perfectly justified, but it is three weeks since it was found: there was no secrecy; it had passed into the hands of third parties who, as has been noted before for some days, paid a full market price for it, and supposing that they should suffer, and supposing, however, that the only object of the Government is to enforce a right, which ought to have been enforced before, and that on a proper acknowledgment of the QUEEN's title, and the payment of a small royalty, the gold will be given up.

THE DEMONSTRATION AGAINST EARL GREY.
The Great Public Meeting held in Sydney on Tuesday last, in pursuance of a requisition from the Council of the AUSTRALASIAN LEAGUE, for the purpose of considering the conduct of Earl Grey on the Transportation Question, was all that could have been wished, not only by the most zealous, but by the most loyal, of the opponents of transportation. The vast numbers who attended, the spacious hall in which they assembled being completely crammed, and the cordial unanimity which prevailed amongst speakers and audience in denouncing both the hateful system itself, and the perfidious means resorted to by the Minister for carrying it out in spite of all that the colonists had done and of all that he himself had promised, were proof sufficient that public opinion on this long agitated question had neither wavered nor cooled, but remained as firm, as uncompromising, as enthusiastic as ever. But the good order that was maintained from the beginning to the close of the proceedings, and the gentlemanly language in which the speakers, even those of them who were most severe in their denunciations of Earl Grey, gave utterance to their opinions and their feelings, left nothing to complain of by the most fastidious sticklers for loyalty and decorum. The noble Earl himself, if he shall condescend to read the report given in yesterday's *Herald*, will be unable to point to a single expression inconsistent either with devoted loyalty to our most gracious QUEEN, or with becoming fairness to his own person and office.

The sentiments of the Meeting were embodied in three resolutions, and more circumstantially detailed in the Petition, all of which were carried unanimously. The Petition has been already twice published in our columns at full length: it may be convenient to introduce the resolutions here. They were as follows:—

1. That with reference to the recently published despatches from Earl Grey, and the speech delivered by his lordship on the 5th of March, 1851, this Meeting is of opinion that the time has arrived for appealing directly to the QUEEN's Most Excellent Majesty, by presentation of a Petition to HER MAJESTY in person, praying HER MAJESTY to dismiss Earl Grey from her councils; and entreating her to command her Ministers to redeem the honour of the British Crown by fulfilling the pledges touching Transportation repeatedly given by them in HER MAJESTY's name to the colonists of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land.

2. That the following Petition be adopted by the Meeting, and signed by the President and New South Wales Council of the League, on behalf of the Meeting.

3. That, in the present position of the Transportation Question, the exertions of the League should not be relaxed, but be prosecuted with increased vigour; and this Meeting pledges itself to accept of no settlement of the question other than the rescinding of the Order in Council by which any part of Australasia is made a place to which offenders may be transported.

The facts upon which the charge preferred against Earl Grey in the first resolution is upheld and substantiated, have been so fully discussed that nothing further on that head need now be said. The character of the charge itself, or rather of the misconduct which the charge imputes, viewed in its bearings on the political welfare of the nation, was most happily portrayed by one of the speakers in his lordship's own language. In the speech in which the noble lord attempted to rebut another charge brought against him by Lord Stanley in 1848, in the celebrated affair of the West India despatch, Earl Grey thus expressed himself:—

"The high character of public men is of the deepest importance to the country. How much of the moral strength of our institutions, of the power, I do not say of the administration of the day, but of the Government in its widest sense—how much of the power of Government in this empire depends upon the general belief of the people of the empire that public men are men of honour!"

In the language of the eloquent Sir

CRISTARY of the League, by whom this appropriate passage was quoted, here "the noble lord for once spoke truth in his political capacity; for falsehood tends to the very dissolution of society. The very soul of society is trust; and the foundation of trust is truth. But when a great public officer is convicted of falsehood, men are at a loss whom to trust, or where to fasten their dependence." Now, it is precisely because the colonists are constrained, by proofs which it is impossible for them to resist, to believe that Earl Grey, in his ministerial proceedings, has broken faith with them—and that in the coolest, most deliberate, and most insulting manner—that they have deemed it to be their duty to the empire at large, as well as to the Australian colonies, to impeach him at the foot of the throne, and entreat his dismissal from HER MAJESTY's Councils. So long as conduct like his is permitted to pass with impunity, so long will they feel it impossible to put faith in what his lordship asserts ought to be a sacred maxim with the people—"That PUBLIC MEN ARE MEN OF HONOUR."

Great stress was laid by several of the speakers on the monstrous injustice of Earl Grey in treating with contemptuous indifference the many numerous signed petitions which have gone home from the colonies during the last four or five years, and the repeated assurances sent up from the Legislative Council, against the renewal of transportation in any shape or on any conditions; whilst to such unauthorised communications as those sent to him by a clerk in the Principal Superintendent of Convicts' Office, and other obscure individuals, he has not only paid the most marked attention, but responded in terms of thankful acknowledgment. Such conduct is incapable of rational defence; and the colonists are right in resenting it with the utmost warmth of indignation.

In thus manfully stepping forward to denounce a great Ministerial delinquency, the AUSTRALASIAN LEAGUE has done itself honour, and established a stronger claim than it even had before to the support and co-operation of all true patriots and all good men. We have more reliance in the LEAGUE than on the gold. As was well said at the meeting, there is no knowing what perverse views may be taken by such Ministers as Lord Grey, with regard to the policy of sending convicts to places within reach of a land of gold; but there can be no uncertainty as to the ultimate triumph of a moral force so powerful and concentrated as that employed by the LEAGUE. In a free and enlightened, a moral and religious community like that of Great Britain, such force, exerted in a right cause, can never fail in the end to gain all it demands. And what our gold could not or might not do for us of itself, coupled with the strenuous and persevering exertions of the LEAGUE, it can and will accomplish.

We have often congratulated our fellow-colonists on their having made the last movement on this odious question; and although we have been as often disappointed by the event, we do hope that such congratulation may now be offered without any apprehension as to what may turn up. With what the wonderful change caused in the circumstances of the colony by the discovery of its auriferous treasures; what with the conversion of those upon whose pro-convict votes in our new Legislature Earl Grey had fixed his dishonourable expectations; and what, above all, with the gigantic organization of the LEAGUE, we flatter ourselves that the axe has at length been laid to the root, and that the felon tree will now fall, and fall for ever. So be it!

LAW INTELLIGENCE.
SUPREME COURT.—SATURDAY.
BEFORE THE FULL COURT.
DEACON v. CARPENT.

This was an action on promises to recover the value of coal shipped in defendant's vessel, the case was tried before his Honor Mr. Justice Trenchard in the sittings in June last for the trial of causes, when a verdict was returned for the plaintiff, damages £980. The principal evidence against the defendant at the trial was a decree pro confesso. The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July. The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

The plaintiff had filed a bill of discovery against the defendant, to which the defendant had put in an appearance but no answer. A nonsuit pursuant to leave reserved, or the new trial was granted, and the case was ordered to be put in issue on the 17th of July.

plaintiff's bill, without committing perjury, bolted away; and therefore this is just such a case in which the bill should be sent pro confesso. The bill being read pro confesso must be taken as a tacit admission of the defendant. There was an appearance entered for the defendant by his attorney in the present action, and an affidavit of service of the bill on the defendant, and this was proved at the trial. If this bill were shown out altogether, there is evidence to support the verdict. There was no evidence before the jury to show that there was a judgment against the plaintiff in California, whilst it was shown that the defendant had sold coal there belonging to the plaintiff. Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

Mr. FISHER, in reply, contended that the English practice with regard to taking bills of discovery pro confesso applied only to persons having privilege of Parliament, and could not govern such a case as this, where the defendant had actually appeared.

